



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/678,020	10/04/2000	Kiichiro Takahashi	1272.C0439	6101	
5514	7590 04/11/2005	EXAMINER			
	ICK CELLA HARPER	BRINICH, STEPHEN M			
	ELLER PLAZA L, NY 10112		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	,		2624		
•			DATE MAILED: 04/11/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Summary		09/678,020	TAKAHASHI ET AL.					
		Examiner	Art Unit					
		Stephen M Brinich	2624					
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address					
THE - Exte after - If the - If NO - Failt Any	MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Insions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. In period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply operiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period or the toreply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing led patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ting within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status								
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 O	ctober 2004.						
·		action is non-final.						
3)								
Dienocit	·							
	ion of Claims							
4)[2]	Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.							
E \□	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>2-4,6,13-15 and 17</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
	Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1,5,7-12,16 and 18-22</u> is/are rejected.							
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.	•						
, —	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.						
	ion Papers	·						
	·	_						
	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce		Evaminer					
10)		· -						
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11)[11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
	under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
		and addressed as DELLO O. 0.4407.)	. (1) (0)					
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received.						
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau	ity documents have been receive						
* 5	See the attached detailed Office action for a list	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	d.					
Attachmen	t(s)							
_	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)					
2) 🔲 Notic	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	te					
	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	atent Application (PTO-152)					

Art Unit: 2624

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's 10/28/04 Remarks (page 7, lines 2-3) describe claims 2-4, 6, 13-15, & 17 as non-elected species that have been withdrawn from consideration. However, claims 6 & 17 are marked as "Amended" rather than "Withdrawn".

Referring to the original 6/17/04 response to the 5/17/04 Election of Species requirement, the correct status of the claims is that set forth in Applicant's Remarks. Claims 6 & 17 remain withdrawn from consideration.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

- 2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
- 3. Claims 1, 5, 7-12, 16, & 18-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Helterline et al.

Re claims 1 & 12, Helterline et al discloses (Abstract; column 4, line 45 - column 5, line 32) an image processing and printing system in which a plurality of density correction data (contents of look-up table 52) are derived from a judgment of printing conditions (actual print density compared to ideal density of a printout). These data are then retained and used to perform density correction corresponding the result of this

Art Unit: 2624

judgment, thereby calibrating the printer. Printing is thus performed in accordance with these printing conditions.

Re claims 5 & 16, the printing calibration regulates the volume of a generated ink drop (column 4, lines 55-63), which inherently determines the dot size generated by an ink jet printer. This determination is performed in accordance with printing conditions (as described above re claims 1 & 12) that are determined in accordance with image data (the line width actually produced and the ideal line width desired).

Re claims 7-8 & 18-19, Helterline et al discloses a plurality of print elements (column 5, lines 33-47), each of which uses the retained calibration data.

Re claims 9-10 & 20-21, Helterline et al discloses (column 1, lines 43-48) an ink jet printing process in which ink is ejected from nozzles using thermal energy.

Re claims 11 & 22, Helterline et al discloses (column 5, lines 15-32) a printing condition judgment by means of a simulation printout (a "calibration run").

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 10/28/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Re claim 1, Applicant argues (10/28/04 Response: page 7, line 12 - page 8, line 21; particularly page 8, lines 1-5 & 17-

Application/Control Number: 09/678,020

Art Unit: 2624

Page 4

20) that the art of record (Helterline et al) does not teach or suggest the claimed retention of density correction data for a plurality of printing conditions and printing in accordance with density correction data for the judged printing condition.

However, as noted above, Helterline et al discloses a lookup table 52 that stores a plurality of printing conditions (the plurality of entries in the table) derived from a judgment of printing conditions (actual print density compared to ideal density of a printout).

Re claim 12, Applicant argues (10/28/04 Response: page 9, lines 1-3) that claim 12 is allowable for the same reasons as claim 1.

This argument has been addressed above.

Re claims 5, 7-11, 16, & 18-22, Applicant argues (10/28/04 Response: page 9, lines 4-8) that these claims are dependent from claims 1 & 12 and therefore allowable for the same reasons as the parent claims.

This argument has been addressed above.

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is

Art Unit: 2624

reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen M. Brinich at 571-272-7430. The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays 7:00-4:30, alternate Fridays off.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Tech Center 2600 Customer Service center at 571-272-2600 or to the USPTO Contact Center at 800-786-9199 or 703-308-4357.

Application/Control Number: 09/678,020

Art Unit: 2624

Page 6

If attempts to contact the examiner and the Customer Service Center are unsuccessful, supervisor David Moore can be contacted at 571-272-7437.

Faxes pertaining to this application should be directed to the Tech Center 2600 official fax number, which is 703-872-9306.

Hand-carried or courier-delivered correspondence pertaining to this application should be directed to

US Patent and Trademark Office 220 South 20th Street Crystal Plaza Two, Lobby, Room 1B03 Arlington VA 22202

> Stephen M Brinich Examiner Art Unit 2624

THOMAS D. TONKY LEE PRIMARY EXAMINER



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

DATE MAILED:

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION		ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
				EVANINED
			EXAMINER	
			ART UNIT	PAPER
				20050407

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents